DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 470 570 HE 035 473

AUTHOR Lederman, Linda C.; Stewart, Lea P.; Laitman, Lisa; Goodhart, Fern; Powell, Richard

TITLE A Case against "Binge" as the Term of Choice: How To Get College Students To Personalize Messages about Dangerous Drinking.

INSTITUTION Higher Education Center for Alcohol and Other Drug Prevention, Newton, MA.

SPONS AGENCY Office of Elementary and Secondary Education (ED), Washington, DC. Safe and Drug Free Schools Program.; Department of Education, Washington, DC.; Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (ED), Washington, DC.; Rutgers, The State Univ., New Brunswick, NJ.

PUB DATE 2000-00-00

NOTE 16p.; Funded by the Rutgers University Health Services and Rutgers University Department of Communication. Part of the Communication and Health Issues Partnership for Education and Research (CHI), Rutgers University. Paper prepared for the Annual Meeting of the National Communication Association (87th, Atlanta, GA, November 1-4, 2001). An earlier version of this paper was presented at the Annual U.S. Department of Education National Conference on Alcohol, Other Drug, and Violence Prevention in Higher Education (14th, Pittsburgh, PA, October 14-17, 2000).

AVAILABLE FROM For full text: http://www.edc.org/hec/pubs/articles/ case-binge.pdf.

PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS Case Studies; *College Students; Higher Education; Qualitative Research; *Student Attitudes

IDENTIFIERS *Binge Drinking

ABSTRACT

The current literature focuses on arguments about strategies to prevent drinking-related behaviors among college students, but inadequate attention is being paid to the words used to conceptualize student drinking behavior. This paper makes the case that students' thinking needs to be taken into account if they are to personalize messages about drinking. Rutgers University, New Jersey, is presented as a case study of on-going data collection designed to reveal what students themselves think. This paper describes an innovative initiative at Rutgers and the use of the term "dangerous drinking" as an alternative to "binge drinking." The Communication and Health Issues Partnership for Education and Research at Rutgers (CHI) has engaged in ongoing qualitative research into drinking practices on campus and has developed and administered a survey instrument. Their findings indicate the importance of approaching campus drinking from multiple perspectives, especially looking at the language used to convey to students what is problematic to students about excessive drinking. (Contains 45 references.) (SLD)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original document.

ED 470 570

The Higher Education Center for Alcohol and Other Drug Prevention
Funded by the U.S. Department of Education, with supplemental funding from The Robert Wood Johnson Foundation

A Case Against "Binge" as the Term of Choice: How to Get College Students to Personalize Messages about Dangerous Drinking

by
Linda C. Lederman, Ph.D.
Lea P. Stewart, Ph.D.
Lisa Laitman, M.S. Ed., C.A.D.C.
Fern Goodhart, M.S., CHES
Richard Powell, M.P.A.

Reprinted with permission from CHI—The Communication and Health Issues Partnership for Education and Research, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, New Jersey. Paper presented at the National Communication Association, Atlanta, GA, 2001, and in an earlier version at the National Conference on Alcohol and Other Drug Prevention, Pittsburgh, 2000.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

The Higher Education Center for Alcohol and Other Drug Prevention
Education Development Center, Inc.
55 Chapel Street, Newton, MA 02458-1060

www.edc.org/hec/ • (800) 676-1730
Fax: (617) 928-1537 • HigherEdCtr@edc.org

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

HE035473

C H I

The Communication and Health Issues Partnership for Education and Research

A Case Against "Binge" as the Term of Choice: How to Get College Students to Personalize Messages about Dangerous Drinking*

by

Linda C. Lederman, Ph. D.
Lea P. Stewart, Ph. D.
Lisa Laitman, M. S. Ed., C. A. D. C.
Fern Goodhart, M. S. CHES.
Richard Powell, M. P. A.

Rutgers University
New Brunswick, New Jersey

*This paper will be delivered at the National Communication Association conference in Atlanta,GA, 2001 and an earlier version at the National Conference on Alcohol and Other Drug Prevention, Pittsburgh, 2000. It is funded in part by grants from the U. S. Department of Education Safe and Drug Free Schools Program, the U. S. Department of Education, Fund for the Improvement of Post Secondary Education, the Rutgers University Health Services and the Rutgers University Department of Communication

THE STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW JERSEY
RUTGERS
Campus at New Brunswick

CHI
The Communication and Health Issues Partnership for Education and Research

School of Communication, Information and Library Studies
Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey
4 Huntington Street
New Brunswick, NJ 08901-1071
(732) 932-0530
Website: www.scils.rutgers.edu/chi
Email: chimail@scils.rutgers.edu

Education • Research • Prevention • Program Development • Evaluation

A Case Against "Binge" as the Term of Choice: How to Get College Students to Personalize Messages about Dangerous Drinking*

by

Linda C. Lederman, Ph. D.
Lea P. Stewart, Ph. D.
Lisa Laitman, M. S. Ed., C. A. D. C.
Fern Goodhart, M. S. CHES.
Richard Powell, M. P. A.

Rutgers University
New Brunswick, New Jersey

*This paper will be delivered at the National Communication Association conference in Atlanta, GA, 2001 and an earlier version was delivered at the National Conference on Alcohol and Other Drug Prevention, Pittsburgh, 2000. It is funded in part by grants from the U. S. Department of Education Safe and Drug Free Schools Program, the U. S. Department of Education, Fund for the Improvement of Post Secondary Education, the Rutgers University Health Services and the Rutgers University Department of Communication.

Abstract

The most recent literature on the prevention of problematic drinking on the college campus includes a growing controversy about approaches to the reduction of college drinking. Putting aside temporarily the question of the effectiveness of one particular prevention strategy versus another, there is certainly no disagreement that college campuses are plagued by drinking and drinking-related problems. Furthermore, there can be little disagreement that many of the college students who drink do so in ways that are more problematic than they themselves comprehend. Thus, while the literature focuses on arguments about strategies to reduce drinking-related behaviors among college students, inadequate attention is currently being paid to the words used to conceptualize students' drinking behavior. This paper argues that students' thinking needs to be taken into account if we want them to personalize messages. It is by understanding their attitudes and behaviors through their own ways of seeing that we can become more effective in framing what we say to them about their drinking and in creating ways of communicating that will resonate with them. Rutgers University is presented as a case study of on-going data collection designed to reveal what students themselves think. This paper describes an innovative initiative at Rutgers, CHI, and its alternative to the term "binge drinking" as "dangerous drinking." The term "dangerous drinking" places the focus on the type of drinking that needs to be addressed, that which is dangerous, in an arena that perhaps most students and adults can agree.

Introduction

The most recent literature on the prevention of problematic drinking on the college campus includes a growing controversy about approaches to the reduction of college drinking. On the one hand, there is an increasing body of literature reporting success in driving

down drinking on college campuses using social norms-based approaches (Haines, 1996; Jeffrey & Negro, 1996; Lederman, et al., 2000b; Perkins, 1996). Advocates of social norms-based approaches claim that students operate under the misperception that everyone on campus drinks excessively (Butler, 1993; Burns, Ballou & Lederman, 1991; Jeffrey & Negro, 1996). Social norms strategies target these misperceptions by providing students with actual norms, reporting that this approach both changes perceptions and drives down actual drinking. On the other hand, some well established researchers report finding increased college drinking and refute social norms campaigns as an unsubstantiated and perhaps harmful fad (Keeling, 2000; Weschler & Kuo, 2000).

These contradictory findings make it unclear as to whether the inaccurate perception that most students drink excessively is shared by the majority of students as the advocates of social norms approaches claim or merely found among sub-groups as articulated by Keeling (2000). Nonetheless strong evidence exists that in one way or another many college students (and their parents and teachers) do share the perception that excessive college drinking is a cultural norm (Butler, 1993), and that this perception is consistently re-created and/or reinforced by the media (including college newspapers with ads for "All You Can Drink" and "Happy Hours"), major advertising that targets students (e.g., beer companies with Spring Break Drinking Campaigns); and even students' own interpersonal experience (e.g., sharing war stories about the "night before"; attending fraternity parties and other social events that encourage alcohol abuse) (Cohen & Lederman, 1998; Haines, 1996; Lederman, 1993; Lederman, Stewart, Barr, Power, Laitman and Goodhart, 1998; Perkins, 1996).

Putting aside temporarily the question of the effectiveness of social norming, there is certainly no disagreement that college campuses are plagued by drinking and drinking-related problems. Furthermore, there can be little disagreement that many of the college students who drink do so in ways that are much more problematic than they themselves comprehend. Weschler and Kuo (2000) report that binge drinkers consistently perceive the norm of heavy drinking as higher than it actually is. In another recent study, researchers at Rutgers found that 92% of students did not think of themselves as binge drinkers, even though 35 % of these students drank at levels that are what researchers use to operationalize binge drinking (Lederman, Stewart, Laitman, Goodhart & Powell, 2000). And as early as 1989, Burns and Goodstadt found students reporting that they didn't think drinking was a problem. "Problem drinking?" asked one student in an interview by Burns and Goodstadt (1989), "I drink. I get drunk. I fall down. No problem."

Thus, while the literature focuses on arguments about strategies to reduce problematic drinking-related behaviors among college students, inadequate attention is currently being paid to the words used to conceptualize students' drinking behavior. Accordingly, and unfortunately, health educators and researchers may be unwittingly contributing to a failure among students to identify with drinking that is problematic. One way in which this is very likely happening is in using the word "binge" to describe drinking on the campus.

What's In a Word?: Binge Drinking

'Binge drinking' is the newest phrase used to describe college drinking that is problematic. It emerged in the late-1990s, initially in the work of the Harvard School for Public Health (Meilman, Cashin, McKillip, & Presley, 1998; Presley, Meilman, & Cashin, 1998; Thonbs, Mahoney & Olds, 1998; Wechsler, 1996; Wechsler, Fulop, Pedilla, Lee & Patrick, 1997). The drinking-related phenomenon that the word is used to describe is five or more drinks in a setting for a male and four or more for a female. Previously the same drinking behavior was referred to in the literature as "at risk drinking"(Burns & Goodstadt, 1989; Carey, 1995; Pasavac, 1993; Perkins, 1992; Jamson et al., 1989). None of these terms are the words that students themselves use to describe their own drinking. In fact, a study at a major Midwestern university it found that calling drinking "risky" was appealing to students; that these students liked to think of themselves as risk-takers (Workman, 1998). Milgram and Anderson (2000) argue that binge actually refers to a situation in which an individual consumes alcohol to the point of intoxication over a long period of time (e.g. two or three days (p.10). Furthermore they point out, when 'binge' is used to refer to a set number of drinks, it fails to take into account what the person is drinking, how large the drinks are, how much the person weighs (p.9).

If students do not relate to the word "binge" as a descriptor of their behaviors, if that word has very different meanings and connotations for them than five or more drinks at a time, health educators and researchers may be making it simply too easy for most students to dismiss reports of binge drinking as what "happens to other people" and to view binges as more extreme behaviors than those with which they can identify.

The problem, then, is what *do* we do to raise students' consciousness and to make them aware of the dangers associated with drinking more than three drinks during a given time period. The purpose of this paper is to address this challenge. It will suggest that one of the ways to help students personalize messages about drinking is to change the use of the word "binge" to a term that more appropriately describes their behavior. It will also suggest that it is necessary to examine how students themselves think to find an alternative word that expresses the concern that anyone ought to have if drinking more than four (women) or five (men) drinks. In order to do this, the paper will review some research at our own university and what we have learned about students, how they themselves think about drinking, and how we are using what we have learned from them about them to frame our own language and our decision to use the term "dangerous drinking" to replace "binge drinking."

How College Students Think About Drinking

Students themselves know a great deal about drinking on campus – whether they drink or do not drink, and whether or not researchers and educators accept the social norms advocates' assertion that students misperceive the norms in terms of how much people drink. Drinking and/or observations of others' drinking-related behaviors are part of what students on the campus experience as part of their college life. This is clear in several ways. First, data collected in surveys across the country support this contention. Through the analysis of the

data gathered through survey research, students' knowledge of drinking on the campus as well as their own self-reported drinking-related behaviors, attitudes and perceptions is evident. (Carey, 1995; Harper et al, 1999; Lederman, et al., 1998; Lederman, et al., 1999; Nezlek, Pilkington & Bilbro, 1994; Rabow, & Duncan-Schill, 1995; Thombs, Wolcott & Farkash, 1997; Weschler, 1996, 1998, 2000). In addition to knowing what students do and how they think, a number of studies have provided insights into why students behave as they do and why they think the way they think (Burns & Goodstadt, 1989; Burns, Ballou & Lederman, 1991; Butler, 1993; Carey, 1995; Cohen & Lederman, 1997; Klein, 1992; Marshall, Scherer & Real, 1998). Taken together, researchers have learned a great deal about what college students know or think they know about drinking.

One thing that has been learned from these studies is that college students who drink do not usually characterize their drinking as problematic. Many of them don't think that five or more drinks is too much to drink, and most don't believe that they have a problem with drinking unless they drink every day (Butler, 1993; Haines, 1996; Lederman, et al., 1998; Lederman, et al., 2000; Perkins, 1994, 1997; Schall, Kemeny & Maltzman, 1992; Senchak, Leonard & Greene, 1998; Weschler & Kuo, 2000). Many of them think that no matter how much they drink that there are others who drink more (Butler, 1993; Berkowitz & Perkins, 1986; Burns, Ballou & Lederman, 1991;Cohen & Lederman, 1997; Lederman, et al., 1999). Many also think that binges are things that happen to others, not to them. In a recent study at Rutgers University, Lederman, et al. (2000) report finding that among students who drink 5 or more drinks, 78.8% disagree with the statement - "Do you consider yourself a binge drinker?" in contrast with the 35.8% who drank dangerously during their last episode of drinking.

As a consequence it is little wonder that some reports in the literature indicate that drinking has not decreased on the college campus in this century (Wechsler & Kuo, 2000). Furthermore, in explaining binge drinking as five or more drinks for a male and four or more drinks for a female, researchers may have created a way of looking at drinking that is simply foreign to most students. Burns, Ballou & Lederman (1991) interviewed students and found that they had a list of terms they used that described how they felt and when they had enough. "When I get the spins, I stop" was typical of the kinds of measures students reported. Nowhere was there any mention of quantity as a measure. Lederman et al (2000b) in following up Burns, Ballou & Lederman's qualitative data found in a random survey of Rutgers University students that 71% of responses indicated that students measured their drinking by behavioral consequences, such as how they felt, than by the number of set drinks they drank.

While Weschler and Kuo (2000) report that the students they label as binge drinkers have a self-serving reason for their differences with the research definition of binge drinking, they do not take into account any of the real differences in the associative meanings, the connotations of the word, 'binge' to these drinkers.

If students do not think there is a problem with their drinking behavior there is little hope that they will be motivated to change that behavior. It seems important, then, to look at the

subject of college drinking through the eyes of college students (Burns, Ballou & Lederman, 1991; Klein, 1992; Lederman, et al., 1999; Rapaport et al., 1999). If we want to do more to change their behaviors, we have to attempt to understand their drinking and their drinking-related behaviors through their own eyes. It is by understanding their attitudes and behaviors through their own ways of seeing that we can become more effective in framing what we say to them about their drinking and in creating ways of communicating with them that will resonate with them.

Talking to Students at Rutgers

Rutgers University is a site for on-going qualitative data collection designed to know what students themselves think. At Rutgers University we have attempted to understand drinking through the eyes of students by engaging in on-going qualitative data collection alongside the quantitative surveys we administer regularly. Our qualitative research extends back more than a decade to the work of an interdisciplinary team led by David Burns (Burns & Goodstadt, 1989; Burns, Ballou & Lederman, 1991) and carried on in later years by the authors as an on-going collaborative entity, The Communication and Health Issues Partnership for Education and Research (CHI).

CHI is founded on the belief that communication is an integral part of the relationally-based nature of health issues. Thus, CHI's commitment to qualitative research to provide insights into its on-going quantitative studies. [In the last three years CHI's work has been funded by the United States Department of Education Safe and Drug Free Schools Program ($240,000; $98, 000), the New Jersey Higher Education Consortium on Alcohol and Other Drug Prevention ($15,000; 15,000; 15,000;), the U.S. Department of Justice ($400,000); the Rutgers University Health Services ($10,000), Rutgers University Department of Communication ($5,000) and the Communities Against Tobacco Coalition of the NCADD, National Council on Alcoholism and Drug Dependence ($10,000).]

With its funding, CHI has engaged in on-going qualitative research into drinking practices on the campus, and also created and administered a survey instrument, the Personal Report of Student Perceptions (PRSP) (1998; 2000), designed and administered intercept interview survey instruments (1998; 1999; 2000), developed various curriculum infusion projects and, most importantly, in terms of understanding students, CHI has developed the Socially Situated Experiential Learning Model (SSEL) (Lederman & Stewart, 1998). The model identifies the conceptual bases that can be used to understand the socially situated nature of college drinking. It relies most heavily on *experiential learning theory,* which argues that learning is cyclical. A person has an experience, reflects on that experience, draws some conclusions about the lessons to be drawn from that experience, and then uses those lessons as part of his or her basis for reactions to future experiences (Kolb, 1984; Lederman, 1992). In terms of college drinking, for example, Burns and Goodstadt (1989) and Burns, Ballou and Lederman (1991) report that students who engage in risky sexual behavior while drinking do not perceive themselves as outcasts in their social circles since in their everyday "experience" their behaviors are the norm as they perceive

them. Cohen and Lederman (1997) found that students valued their own first hand experiences as ways of learning how to drink, unaware or unconcerned of the potentially life-threatening consequences of learning by trial and error. Experiential learning theory would suggest that it is important to look at the reflection that students do about their drinking and the conclusions to which it leads them. If they interpret fellow students' reactions to heavy drinking, for example, as making them seem socially attractive, then they may have "learned from the experience" to drink heavily.

The SSEL model provides the conceptual base upon which CHI approaches learning about drinking on the campus and creating interventions to address drinking-related issues and students' drinking-related experiences. One such intervention, Imagine That! (Lederman 1992), is a game about drinking-related decisions and dating that is currently in use at more than 250 institutions across the U.S. and in Canada. The purpose of these interventions is to insert other ways of interpreting experiences into the learning cycles of students.

Based on the years of work at Rutgers, CHI has come to learn a great deal about students, their drinking and their thinking, and how and why they interpret their experiences as they do. It is what we have learned that forms the basis for our argument against using "binge" as the word of choice to describe drinking practices of students. Students themselves know much about their drinking and have much to learn. We need to review what they know, and what we have learned from them, as the basis for providing an alternative word to "binge" that is meaningful for both the academic community and the subjects of their studies—the students themselves.

What DO Students Think is Problem Drinking

As early as 1989, researchers at Rutgers and elsewhere (Burns & Goodstadt, 1989; Burns, Ballou & Lederman, 1991; Cohen & Lederman, 1997; Klein, 1992) were conducting focus group research to understand the 'why' behind the numbers reported in quantitative studies of drinking on the campus. As Cohen and Lederman (1997) report, students have their own way of thinking about drinking, and their own ways of explaining what drinking does for them, and why drinking is part of the learning experience during the college years. From the interviews at Rutgers extending for a period of over 10 years, we have learned about students' perceptions of the role alcohol plays in their lives and their own sense of the problems and consequences associated with drinking.

The Role Students Say Alcohol Play in their Lives

In a series of focus group interviews, a team of researchers at Rutgers University led by David Burns found that students thought that alcohol functioned as a social facilitator by making it possible for students under the influence to initiate relationships or have interactions they might not normally have (Burns, Ballou & Lederman, 1991). Alcohol was reported by many of the students interviewed as helping them to overcome shyness and in doing so allowing those students who were too shy or feeling isolated, lonely or alienated

from their peers to make connections with others.

Students expressed this perception of alcohol by referring to it as a social "glue"(Burns, Ballou & Lederman, 1991). They reported thinking that alcohol bonds them together in situations that are normally more private or isolated. For example, many students reported over-consuming alcohol and vomiting at the end of the night. When they are not doing this in full view of others in the common bathrooms, they reported making sure to tell their roommates and neighbors about it the next day.

In interviews conducted both for the 1989 study (Burns, Ballou & Lederman, 1989) and in 1997 (Cohen & Lederman, 1997) students reported alcohol as an inducement to bonding by forcing student dependence on their friends. Interviewees described that often a student gets too drunk and needs literally, to be taken care of, e.g., carried home, given a garbage can to throw up in, or extracted from a sexually threatening situation. In an interview conducted by Lederman for the study with Cohen (Cohen & Lederman, 1997) one female student reported that she knew that "Beth was my best friend, when she held my hair back from my face when I was throwing up into the toilet." It was not unusual either, to have students report that they or others use alcohol to excuse 'wild' behavior or sexual behavior that they might not otherwise admit to have engaged in.

In sum, these qualitative reports express that students themselves have first hand experience with drinking and drinking-related behaviors either themselves or as witnesses to others. This makes them think that they know a great deal about alcohol. And in some ways they do. Certainly what these interviews provide is some insight into the role they think that alcohol plays for them in their social lives. If this is what they think alcohol does for them in terms of positive social experiences, it is easier to understand why they'd be reluctant to give it up, or even be open to being told that there is something wrong with their drinking behavior.

Clearly not all students on any campus make these same attributions to alcohol. It is well known, however, that those who drink the most tend to make the most positive attributions to alcohol (Burns & Goodstadt, 1989; Prendargast, 1994). Since it is those people, and the people influenced by their behaviors, that we most want to reach with prevention campaigns, we need to know that this is what they may be thinking.

How Students See Problem Drinking and Its Consequences

This is not to say that students are blind to problem drinking. To the contrary, they have their own ways of thinking about problem drinking. In two recent random mailed surveys at Rutgers University (1998; 2000), students reported that they thought that frequency rather than quantity was the measure of someone having a problem with alcohol. A drink a day would be seen to these students as more problematic than eight drinks on one occasion once a semester. Students do not think that drinking until they get "buzzed," "plastered," or "out of it" is a problem (Lederman, 1993).

In earlier studies at Rutgers, Burns, Ballou & Lederman (1991) found that students classify problem drinking into four broad categories. The first category of problem drinking the students labeled as "Drinking Until You Are Out of Control." This was described by them

in focus group interviews (Burns, Ballou & Lederman, 1991) as when there is an inability to stop or a loss of control/when there is too much emphasis placed upon alcohol in your life and you are giving up everything to drink/if you can't say no/if you can't go through a "dry" weekend.

The second category of problem drinking reported by Burns, Ballou & Lederman (1991) was based on "Frequency." This was described as when the number of times a person drinks during a given period of time is "excessive." It was talked about when the person drinks every night. It was also described as when a person drinks all the time or when a person is perceived as drinking continuously. The third category of problem drinking was focused on people whose behavior was "Hurtful to Themselves or Others." This was described as the instance in which drinking causes behavior which is physically, emotionally, or academically hurtful to the person or to others.

Finally, students described another category of problem drinking (Burns, Ballou & Lederman, 1991). This was called the "Motivation or Attitude Problem." A person's attitude toward alcohol can be a "tip-off" to a problem with it, i.e. if someone is drinking just to drink, that is a problem. If someone is drinking to relax or reduce stress that is not a problem. Students said that even if they were drinking a whole case of beer to reduce the stress, it wasn't a problem. The problem had to do with the motivation. This category is independent of quantity and reliant upon motivation

What was conspicuously absent from this list generated from the students was any mention at all of quantity (Burns, Ballou & Lederman, 1991). This same finding occurred in studies reported by Lederman (1993) and Cohen and Lederman (1997). The quantity of alcohol consumed didn't seem to affect what students defined as a problem, hence the students did not pay attention to limiting the amount they drank. Instead, they spoke of limits in terms of impaired judgment and the resultant negative consequences or illness. They were also not fundamentally disturbed by the frequency of vomiting. This is understandable in light of the students' perceptions of bonding around dealing with the consequences of drinking too much. What a recent study at Rutgers indicates is that students were more concerned with frequency than quantity (Lederman et al., 2000).

There is more that we know about how students think about drinking. Students, even heavy drinking students, are aware of the consequences, or at least some of them, of heavy drinking. The most consequential of these are seen as relational consequences: getting taken advantage of (sexually or socially), getting into sexually intimate relationships too quickly, embarrassing oneself, or getting into situations that are violent.

These are not only consequences that appear on the police rosters or campus police data sheets, but also things that students themselves report in one-to-one and focus group interviews (Burns, Ballou & Lederman, 1991; Cohen & Lederman, 1997; Harper et al., 1999). While students report personal and physical consequences, e.g. vomiting, passing out, hangovers/headaches, these are not as significant to them unless they have consequences for their relationships with others. Furthermore, students reported that they thought that they simply had to learn about drinking from their own experiences (Burns, Ballou & Lederman, 1991; Cohen & Lederman,

1997; Lederman et al., 1999). When asked who had taught them to drink in these ways, again and again students explained that they simply had to learn through/by experience what they personally could and could not do. They had to learn for themselves their own limits/capacity (Cohen & Lederman, 1997). For instance, in interviews conducted by the Burns team in 1991, a student reported:

> *The first time I got drunk I puked and I got really sick and ugly. I realized that drinking a lot is not a whole lot of fun.*

Drinking and learning to handle it was seen as a right of passage into adulthood. It was about testing limits and learning from those experiments. As a student working on a research report exclaimed when talking about first year students:

> *Those cheesy freshman girls. It embarrasses me to realize that two years ago I was one of them.*

In interviewing students, Cohen and Lederman (1997) found that students did not want to interfere in what they perceived to be other students' rights to learn from their own experiences. In more recent interviews with undergraduates, those who drink heavily find themselves skeptical that they are in the minority, since they surround themselves with others who drink like them.

Implications

In sum, what the above discussion indicates is that it is important to re-examine the basis on which we are trying to get information from students about their drinking and the ways in which we use the terms we select to indicate drinking-related problems. The problem of drinking on campus is complex, so, too, must be the answers and approaches. Multiple approaches to dealing with this problem, which includes evaluation research for all of them, and continuous assessment of our effectiveness, are necessary but not sufficient. In addition, it is important to look at the language being used to convey to students what is problematic about excessive college drinking. To the extent that there is much that is known about our primary audience, college students, and the ways in which they think, there is a solid basis for making decisions about the word to choose to indicate problematic drinking. There are two very different but important drawbacks to the word "binge" as the word of choice. First, binge is inflammatory. On the one hand, it creates an image far worse than what is happening and, on the other hand, it is easy to deny, seeing it as what happens to others. What is an alternative? We suggest the term "dangerous drinking" is an alternative

Dangerous Drinking: Advantages of the Term

As an alternative to the term "binge drinking," we advocate "dangerous drinking." It is a term that has several advantages. First, it is a term that came from students themselves. When a group of student leaders at Rutgers University was asked by a university-

wide blue ribbon committee to identify what term, if any, they thought they could identify more with than binge drinking, they suggested "dangerous drinking." They rejected "binge drinking" because they thought that students didn't identify with it. They rejected "high risk drinking" because they thought that some students thought that high risk was "cool." They rejected "responsible drinking" because they did not like the value judgment in it, pointing out to the committee that those members of the community who had alcoholism were the drinkers who would be labeled irresponsible and that that seemed to them to be blaming the victim of a disease. "Dangerous drinking" was a term they liked because they saw that it had differential application the way the "responsible drinking" does but without the value judgment. Instead they saw the term "dangerous drinking" as putting the focus where it should be—on outcomes.

The term, "dangerous drinking," places the focus on the type of drinking that needs to be addressed, that which is dangerous, in an arena that perhaps most students and adults can agree. Instead of having the situation where students are almost always at odds with adults, we may have more agreement of what is a problem if we were both discussing drinking that is a problem. If a male student has 5-6 drinks during a party that starts at 11pm and ends at 4am, consumes food and spaces his drinks out over this period, this is not necessarily problem drinking. Yet if a student has too much to drink in a short amount of time and needs to be taken to the hospital with alcohol poisoning, this should be defined as dangerous drinking. Yet the definition of a "binge drinking" does not include time or consequence as a factor, an issue that is often raised by students.

Conclusion: It's Not What You Call It—Entirely

The use of the term "dangerous drinking" grows out of what we have learned from employing this approach to our research at Rutgers. It is our term of choice based on what we have learned about students from students.

While using the term "dangerous drinking" does resonate with students, it does not solve the controversy over social norms approaches. It does grow out of a socially situated approach to college drinking, Lederman and Stewart's (1999) Socially Situated Experiential Learning Model. Fundamentally the approach argues that what students know about drinking they learn in their social interactions with one another. It is an approach that focuses on understanding students' thinking in order to try to change their drinking.

Given that we know that the people who need to be reached the most are those students who are the least likely to want to learn that their drinking is problematic, the words we choose to describe their drinking need to be carefully thought out. The word 'binge' lets them off the hook; it is easy for them to think of binges as something that other people do, to associate it with alcoholics, and to think of alcoholism as something to avoid rather than as a disease. For many students, the word "alcoholic" still carries with it the stigma that many health educators try to eliminate. For many students, despite the fact that their families may contain people suffering from alcoholism, the word alcoholic is a put down, and so long as they don't have to use that word to describe themselves, they think they have no problems with alcohol. This means, of course, that

when they go out to party and get 'smashed' they may be ignorant of the real dangers associated with what they are doing; dangers that go beyond what they know about drinking and problems associated with drinking. If we want to alert them, first we have to get their attention. The word, binge, doesn't do it. Let's see if "dangerous drinking" can be a better way to get them to be more able to reflect upon their own-drinking-related choices.

References

Berkowitz, A.D., & Perkins, H.W. (1986). Problem drinking among college students: A review of recent literature. Journal of American College Health, 35, 21-28.

Burns, D., & Goodstadt, M. (1989). Alcohol use on the Rutgers University campus: A study of various communities. Unpublished. US Department of Education Fund for the Improvement of Post Secondary Education (FIPSE) conference paper.

Burns, D., Ballou, J., & Lederman, L. (1991a). Perceptions of alcohol use and policy on the college campus: Preventing alcohol/drug abuse at Rutgers University. Unpublished. U.S. Department of Education Fund for the Improvement of Post Secondary Education (FIPSE) conference paper.

Burns, D., Ballou, J., & Lederman, L.(1991b). Perceptions of alcohol use and policy on the college campus: Preventing alcohol/drug abuse at Rutgers University. Communication and Health Issues Research Series: Report #1. New Brunswick, NJ: Communication and Health Issues Partnership for Education and Research, School of Communication, Information and Library Studies, Rutgers University.

Butler, E.R. (1993). Alcohol use by college students: A rite of passage ritual. NASPA Journal, 31 (1), 48-55.

Carey, K. B. (1995). Alcohol-related expectancies predict quantity and frequency of heavy drinking among college students. Psychology of Addictive Behaviors, 9(4), 236-241.

Carey, K.B. (1995). Heavy drinking contexts and indices of problem drinking among college students. Journal of Studies on Alcohol, 56, 287-292.

Cohen, D., & Lederman, L. (1998). Navigating the freedom of college life: Students talk about alcohol, gender, and sex. In N. Roth & L. Fuller (Eds.), Women and AIDS: Negotiating Safer Practices, Care, and Representation (pp. 101-126). New York: Haworth Press.

Department of Health and Human Services. (1990). Healthy people 2000--National health promotion and disease prevention objectives. PHS91-50212. Washington DC.

Gonzalez, G.M. & Broughton, E.A. (1994). Changes in college student drinking and alcohol knowledge: A decade of progress, 1981-1991. Journal of Alcohol and Drug Education, 39 (3) 56-62.

Haines, M. P. (1996). A social norms approach to preventing binge drinking at colleges and universities. U.S. Department of Education (Publication No. ED/OPE/96-18): Education Development Center, Inc.

Harper, N.L., Lederman, L., Stewart, L., Yee, M., Kennedy, L., Galen, L., Winebarger, A., Barr, S., Powell, R., Laitman, L. & Goodhart, F. (1999). A study of drinking among Grand Valley State University and Rutgers University students: Preliminary results of the personal report of student perceptions (PRSP). Communication and Health Issues Research Series: Report #7. New Brunswick, NJ: Communication and Health Issues P, School of Communication, Information and Library Studies, Rutgers University.

Jeffrey, L. R., & Negro, P. (1996). Contemporary trends in alcohol and other drug use by college students in New Jersey. New Jersey Higher Education Consortium on Alcohol and other Drug Prevention and Education.

Keeling, R. (2000). The political, social, and public health problems of binge drinking in college. Journal of American College Health, 48, 243-246.

Klein, H. (1992). Self-reported reasons for why college students drink. Journal of Alcohol and Drug Education, 37 (2) 14-28.

Lederman, L.C. (1992). IMAGINE THAT! A simulation of drinking and decision-making. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Health Education Services.

Lederman, L. C. (1993). Friends don't let friends beer goggle: A case study in the use and abuse of alcohol and communication among college students. In E. B. Ray (Ed.), Case Studies In Health Communication. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Lederman, L.C. & Stewart, L.P. (1998). Addressing the culture of college drinking through correcting misperceptions: Using experiential learning theory and Gilligan's work. Communication and Health Issues Research Series: Report #4. New Brunswick, NJ: Communication and Health Issues Partnership for Education and Research, School of Communication, Information and Library Studies, Rutgers University.

Lederman, L.C., Stewart, L.P., Kennedy, L., Powell, R., & Goodhart, F. (1998). Self report of student perceptions: An alcohol awareness measure. Communication and Health Issues Research Series: Report #2. New Brunswick, NJ: Communication and Health Issues Partnership for Education and Research, School of Communication, Information and Library Studies, Rutgers University.

Lederman, L.C., Stewart, L., Barr, S., Powell, R., Laitman, L., & Goodhart, F. (1999). Reconceptualizing college drinking as socially situated experiential learning. Communication and Health Issues Research Series: Report #5. New Brunswick, NJ: Communication and Health Issues Partnership for Education and Research, School of Communication, Information and Library Studies, Rutgers University.

Lederman, L. C., Stewart, L. P., Kennedy, L., Powell, R .,Goodhart, F., Laitman, L., Barr, S.,. & McLaughlin, P. (2000 a). RU SURE? The role of communication theory and experiential learning in addressing dangerous drinking on the college campus. In L. C. Lederman, & W. D. Gibson. (Eds.) Communication Theory: A Casebook Approach. Dubuque, Iowa: Kendall Hunt.

Lederman, L. C., Stewart, L. P., Kennedy, L., Donovan, B., Powell, R., Goodhart, F., Barr, S., Laitman, L., McLaughlin, P. (2000 b) Using qualitative and quantitative methods to triangulate the research process: The role of communication in perpetuating the myth of dangerous drinking as the norm on college campuses In S. L. Herndon & G. L. Kreps (Eds.), Qualitative Research: Applications in Organizational Communication, 2nd ed. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.

Marshall, A., Scherer, C.W., & Real, K. (1998). The relationship between students' social networks and engaging in risky behaviors: The college tradition of "Drink 'til You Drop." Journal of Health Communication, 11 (2), 34-41.

Meilman, P.W., Cashin, J. R., McKillip, J.R., & Presley, C.A. (1998). Understanding the three national databases on collegiate alcohol and drug use. Journal of American College Health, 46(4), 168.

Milgram, G. G. & Anderson, D.S. (2000). Action planner: Steps for develolping a comprehensive campus alcohol abuse prevention program. Fairfax, Virginia: George Mason University.

Nezlek, J.B., Pilkington, C.J., & Bilbro, K.G. (1994). Moderation in excess: Binge drinking and social interaction among college students. Journal of Studies on Alcohol, 55, 342-351.

Pasavac, E. J. (1993). College students' views and excessive drinking and the university role. Journal of Drug Education, 23(3), 237-245.

Perkins, W. H. (1992). Gender patterns in consequences of collegiate alcohol abuse: A 10-year study of trends in a undergraduate population. Journal of Studies on Alcohol, 53, 458-462.

Perkins, W. (1994). Confronting misperceptions of peer drug use norms among college students: An alternative approach for alcohol and other drug education programs. In L. Grow (Ed.), FIPSE drug prevention programs in higher education training institute manual, 4th. Ed., Washington, D.C. Fund for the Improvement of Post Secondary Education, U.S. Department of Education.

Perkins, W., & Wechsler, H. (1996). Variation in perceived college drinking norms and its impact on alcohol abuse: A nationwide study. Journal of Drug Issues, 26, (4), 961-974.

Prendergast, M. L. (1994). Substance use and abuse among college students: A review of recent literature. College Health, 43, n.p.

Presley, C. A., Meilman, P.W., & Cashin, J. R. (1998). Weapon carrying and substance abuse among college students. Journal of American College Health, 46(1), 16.

Rabow, J. & Duncan-Schill, M. (1995). Drinking among college students. Journal of Alcohol and Drug Education, 40 (3) 52-64.

Rapaport, R.J., Minelli, M.J., Angera, J.J. & Thayer, J.E. (1999). Using focus groups to quickly assess students' opinions about alcohol issues and programs. Journal of College Student Development, 40 (3) 311-314.

Samson, H., et al. (1989). The relation of initial alcohol experience to current alcohol consumption in a college population. Journal of Studies on Alcohol, 50(3), n.p.

Schall, M., Kemeny, A., & Maltzman, I. (1992). Factors associated with alcohol use in university students. Journal of Studies on Alcohol, 53 (2), 122-136.

Senchak, M., Leonard, K.E., & Greene, B.W. (1998). Alcohol use among college students as a function of their typical social drinking context. Psychology of Addictive Behaviors, 12 (1), 62-70.

Thombs, D. L., Mahoney, C., & Olds, R. S. (1998). Application of a bogus testing procedure to determine college students' utilization of genetic screening for alcoholism. Journal of American College Health, 47(3), 106.

Thombs, D.L., Wolcott, B.J. & Farkash, L.G.E. (1997). Social context, perceived norms, and drinking behavior in young people. Journal of Substance Abuse, 9, 257-267.

Wechsler, H. (1996, July/August). Alcohol and the American college campus: A report from the Harvard School of Public Health. Change, n.p.

Wechsler, H., Davenport, A., Dowdall, G., Mooykens, B., and Castillo, S. (1994). Health and behavior consequences of binge drinking in college. Journal of the American Medical Association, 272, (21), 1672-1677.

Wechsler, H., Fulop, M., Padilla, A., Lee, H., & Patrick, K. (1997). Binge drinking among college students: A comparison of California and other states. Journal of American College Health, 45(6), 273.

Wechsler, H., Lee, J. E., Kuo, M., & Lee, H. (2000). College binge drinking in the 1990s: A continuing problem; results of the Harvard School of Public Health 1999 college alcohol study. Journal of American College Health, 48, 199-211.

Wechsler, H., Mocykens, B., Davenport, A., Castillo, S., & Hansen, J. (1995). The adverse impact of heavy episodic drinking on other college students. Journal of Alcohol Studies, 56, (6), 628-634.

Workman, T.A. (1999). Constructions from within the collegiate drinking culture: An analysis of fraternity drinking stories. Paper presented at the annual Meeting of the National Communication Association, New York, NY.

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

NOTICE

Reproduction Basis

	This document is covered by a signed "Reproduction Release (Blanket)" form (on file within the ERIC system), encompassing all or classes of documents from its source organization and, therefore, does not require a "Specific Document" Release form.
X	This document is Federally-funded, or carries its own permission to reproduce, or is otherwise in the public domain and, therefore, may be reproduced by ERIC without a signed Reproduction Release form (either "Specific Document" or "Blanket").